

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that dependent Claims 11-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant submits new Claim 23, which combines the features of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 9-11. Similarly, Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the allowable features of dependent Claims 9-11. In addition, independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 9-11 are canceled and dependent Claims 2, 12, 14 have been amended to provide proper dependency to new Claim 23.

Therefore, it is submitted that independent Claim 20 and new independent Claim 23 are in condition for allowance based upon the above amendments incorporating the features of dependent Claims 9-11.

Accordingly, all four obviousness rejections raised in the final Office Action are now moot since both base Claims 20 and 23 now recite at least one feature which the Examiner indicates is not found in the prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the application contain patentable subject matter and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
PJE:DJD:tam